

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TRAVIS TERRY,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:17-CV-671

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

ORDER

Defendant moves for entry of a discovery protective order (ECF No. 40). Plaintiff reportedly concurs in the request, and in the proposed terms. The Court readily agrees that a discovery protective order is appropriate under Rule 26 (c), but the Court does not accept the parties' proposed terms.

In particular:

- 1) The Court does not authorize sealed filing in advance. Local Rule 10.6 governs requests for sealing, a showing of good cause beyond that needed under Rule 26(c) is required. The Court rarely grants motions to seal.
- 2) The Court will not enjoin parties and non-parties in advance of any behavior that may violate the terms of the protective order. The Court will evaluate claimed violations and appropriate sanctions if and when they occur.
- 3) The Court does not understand proposed paragraph 8.

The parties may submit a new proposed order.

Date: June 7, 2018

/s/ Robert J. Jonker
ROBERT J. JONKER
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE